DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 259 FL 007 505

AUTHOR Paulston, Christina Bratt
TITLE Language and Social Class: Pronouns of Address in Swedish. Working Papers in Sociolinguistics, No. 29.
INSTITUTION Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY Social Science Research Council, New York, N.Y. Committee on Sociolinguistics.
PUB DATE Dec 75
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cross Cultural Studies; Dialect Studies; Form Classes (Languages); Language Patterns; Language Styles; *Language Variation; *Pronouns; Social Class; *Social Dialects; Social Differences; Sociocultural Patterns; *Sociolinguistics; *Standard Spoken Usage
IDENTIFIERS *Address Forms (Languages); *Swedish

ABSTRACT

The Swedish address system is in a state of rapid change. Consequently, Swedes are now more than ever sensitive to the seeming lack of generally accepted rules of usage. This paper attempts to codify the rules for usage of the personal pronouns "du" and "ni." In so doing, it finds that "du" may be used to express either solidarity or intimacy-familiarity, while "ni" exists in old peasant form as well as in current polite and impolite forms. Generally speaking, one can describe the Swedish address system adequately only if one recognizes that Swedish social classes have different rules due to different semantics (i.e., the covariation between the pronoun used and the objective relationship existing between speaker and addressee) of the pronouns "du" and "ni." (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125259

WORKING PAPERS IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS

Number 29

December, 1975

Language and Social Class: Pronouns of Address in Swedish

by

Christina Bratt Paulston
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FL007505

Sponsored by the Social Science Research Council
Committee on Sociolinguistics
Prepared and distributed at

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to attempt an adequate description of forms of address in Swedish and the patterning of their usage. "Det kan du aldrig göra," you'll never do it, it can't be done was a very frequent reaction by Swedes when I stated this purpose as the subject of my studies and fieldwork during my sabbatical stay in Sweden last year. The Swedish address system is in a stage of rapid change and consequently, although Swedes have been aware of the difficulties of their address system for the last hundred years, they are now more than ever sensitive to the seeming lack of generally accepted rules of usage. Indeed, the rules for some encounters are so vague that several informants report -- and I noticed it in my own usage as well -- that a particular form of address simply depended on the individual's mood that day, whether he was feeling cheerful or kranky. Nevertheless, there exists considerably more order than Swedes at present give their language credit for, and this paper is an attempt to map out that order.

Although no rationale is really needed for undertaking a basic description of an area where none exists, it might be helpful to the reader in interpreting the data if I state the particular interest which led me to this study. Address systems of a language correlate highly with social structure. In Sweden, the Social Democratic party has been in power continuously since 1932 and through its programs for social, economic, and educational reforms has consistently stressed egalitarian relations among all members of society. However, in spite of the dominant political ideology, there remain "strong elements of ascription, elitism, particularism and diffuseness in the Swedish value system."[1] The Swedish people

is still divided in Social grupp 1, 2, and 3, a division into social classes first used in 1911 in connection with bicameral elections. In 1970, social group 1 (the upper class) counted 7.8% of the population, social group 2 (middle class) 34.7%, and social group 3 (working class) 57.5%.[2] Politically induced social structural change does not necessarily result in a change in the cultural value system. Söderberg, a social historian, posits the change in address forms as an indicator of social change with concomitant cultural change.[3] He may be right even though Sweden still remains a country highly stratified in terms of social class. Although I attempt no problematic statement in this paper of the relationship between social structure, cultural change and forms of address, the interest in this relationship is the motivation which underlies the present study.

The present data was collected during a five months stay in Stockholm, Sweden during 1973. Methods of data collection included participant observation and the taking of copious field notes in situations which ranged from a royal dinner in white tie to a coffee clatch in the cafeteria of low salaried factory workers, structured and unstructured interviews, survey questionnaires and archive work. Special care was taken to corroborate the accuracy of self report data by first hand observation. Frequently my own observations were augmented by those of others (friends, family, colleagues, students, informants) after they had been especially instructed in what to observe. In my study of the police, for example, a number of people were simply told to talk to police officers and to note how the officers addressed them. I talked to the police myself. I then used my own observations and those of my "assistants" in checking the data obtained in an interview with the instructors at the police

school in order to estimate the reliability of their reported usage.[4] When I studied various department stores, I would interview the staff supervisors in a series of two interviews, the first of which partially served to alert them to certain questions and situations. After some weeks I would follow up with a second interview. In the period between the two interviews, the supervisors had watched for and recorded specific speech behaviors, (e.g., did customer or clerk initiate form of address) and it became quite clear to me that their observations which I collected at the second interview were just as accurate as my own and so deserved to be classified as participant observation data rather than interview reported data.

I mention this technique of "training" (the observation of address forms is a fairly simple operation which does not necessitate any sophisticated linguistic knowledge) some actual members of the group under study in doing the participant observation themselves as it does away with an otherwise insolvable problem. If I am interested in comparing the external system of address behavior of department store staff (i.e. how they speak in the presence of customers) with their internal system (i.e. how they speak among themselves), there is no way my presence is not going to cause them to switch to the external system. Study of the internal system necessitates either self report data or direct observations made by informants with membership in the group under study.

II. A LINGUISTIC DESCRIPTION OF FORMS OF ADDRESS

A. Forms of Address

Swedish possesses two second person singular pronouns of address, with the typical distinction in European languages between the familiar, du,

and the formal, ni. But because of a reluctance in the past by many Swedes to use ni, Swedish also uses several other forms of address. In an earlier paper, I listed 11 different ways of expressing What do you want? and I relist them here:

1.	Vad vill du ha?	'What do you want?' (familiar form)
2.	Vid vill ni ha?	'What do you want?' (formal form)
3.	Vad vill hon ha?	'What does she want?'
4.	Vad vill Christina (fru Paulston ~ Professor Paulston) ha?	'What does Christina (Mrs. Paulston ~ Professor Paulston) want?'
5.	Vad vill fröken ha?	'What does the Miss want?'
6.	Vad vill professorn ha?	'What does the professor want?'
7.	Vad vill man ha?	'What does one want?'
8.	Vad vill vi ha?	'What do we want?'
9.	Vad får det vara?	'What may it be?'
10.	Vad behagas (det)?	'What is pleased?'
11.	Vad skulle det vara for någonting?	'What would it be?'[5]

All forms in 3 through 11 represent a relationship between speakers where du is not appropriate, i.e. where an expression of "condescension or intimacy" in Brown and Gilman's[6] terms is not called for. These forms also represent a way of avoiding using ni, and Swedes are very conscious of that avoidance. In the earlier paper, I speculated that the extreme address avoidance of the V-form in Swedish is due to the "linguistic compulsion" of power coding (as expressed by the du/ni choice) in a country which exhibits a dichotomy between social class stratification and Social Democratic ideology. This is only partially true, and Haugen

was absolutely right when he at that conference pointed out the importance of the historical development of ni.[7]

The major argument of this paper is that one can only describe the Swedish address system adequately if one recognizes that the social classes have different rules due to different semantics[8] of the pronouns du and ni. This difference, I believe, can primarily be accounted for by the historical development of the language and by political ideology.

B. Du.

1. Solidarity du

Du was originally the only singular pronoun of address in Swedish, and only during the 1600's did I come to be used in address to a single person. (Ni derives from I.) Within the peasant population, du remained as the mutual form of address of equals to known and unknown, and this mode of address has survived to the present day within the labour class. The semantics of this du is one of solidarity, an expression of membership in the same group, and it occurs in conjunction with first name (FN) but more frequently with no name (ØN), even when the name is known. Although this du is used to express solidarity, the use of first name is often avoided since it is felt to express intimacy. Presumably this reflects the influence of the upper class reciprocal du which is one of intimacy and which always co-occurs with first name. University students now by institutional decree address their professors with du , du as an expression of group membership. Said my Swedish colleague: "Well, I have gotten used to du but when they come and say 'Hör du, Bengt' - that's going too far." My students freely addressed me as du, even at guest lectures, but even my regular students never referred to me by name. It was of course difficult for them since it meant that they had to

have eye contact with me before they could be recognized to speak, lacking a linguistic means by which they could call my attention. In the primary and secondary schools such a situation has led to the use of du and fröken, a combination of the informal pronoun and the formal traditional address of women teachers (originally the title for unmarried daughters of the nobility) which is totally counterintuitive, and I am relieved I can trust my informants by virtue of the fact that I have heard it with my own ears. Other informants from social group II and III have commented on the difficulty of first naming with solidarity du. They frequently resort to some kind of made up name or nickname (NN). Swedish last names commonly end in -son, 'son of,' and there are several occurences in the data where someone with the name, say, of Valter Danielsson, is addressed as du and Daniel in the attempt to avoid the first name.

The use of solidarity du has now spread to members of all social classes, in social group I primarily among the younger members who frequently comment that they use it as an expression of their egalitarian ideology. The solidarity du is always intended by the addressor to be reciprocal, but there are numerous instances in my observed data that du is not returned. Several taxicab drivers, for instance, who claimed that they virtually always addressed their clients with du, carefully avoided any pronoun reference to me, even when I addressed them as du. (The use of ni by the cab driver would have been insulting in such a situation as it would blatantly have denied any claims to solidarity.) Throughout my conversations with the cab drivers runs a clear awareness on their part of social class, which speech and appearance are used to determine.

Generally the informants claimed that they waited to see how they were addressed, meaning they would reciprocate the same address form which in fact they didn't. "It also depends on how they talk," said one, "if they are bildade." Bildade roughly corresponds to educated and is a frequent euphemism for membership in social group I. This sentiment was echoed by many informants. In other words, although members of social group I are increasingly adopting the use of solidarity du, this usage is many times met with distrust by members of social group III who do not return it, and the result is a condescending du, i.e. the non-reciprocal du in Brown and Gilman's terms,[9] the very opposite of what was intended.

The institutionalized usage of solidarity du has now become widespread. The hallmark of labour unions and the social democratic party membership, the decreed use of du now occurs in hospitals, universities and the like and even in such institutions which function in the interests of the upper class like Svenska Arbetsgivareföreningen (Swedish Employers Association). But members will address each other as du only when their social intercourse is a function of group membership. In the academic community, professors now address each other as du (except for old and pompous ones), but at the Nobel Awards Banquet, a formal dinner at which the king presides, there was a general use of ni and titles among the academicians.[10]

2. Intimacy-familiarity du

The intimacy du of course overlaps with solidarity du and may well eventually become merged with it, but at this time it is distinguishable. The Swedish elite was during the 1700's under strong French influence, and the du/ni dichotomy seems to have developed in the upper classes under influence of French tu and vous. The old peasant singular du usage thus

developed into two forms, the familiar du used with friends and relatives and the formal ni used with others. The intimacy-familarity du differs from the solidarity du in the following aspects: 1) It always co-occurs with FN or kinship term (KT), and 2) its use is always verbally acknowledged.

There exists an elaborate set of rules[11] as to whose right it is to initiate the use of du (primarily from ni and/or title-last name (TLN) usage), and worries and misunderstandings about this initiation right occur frequently in the data. The rules which are found in the Swedish etiquette books involve the variables of sex, age, and rank in that order of importance. It is always the prerogative of a woman to initiate du with age and rank deciding if the speakers are of the same sex. Age is not necessarily chronological but may involve other factors, especially year of high school matriculation. But note that these are the rules of the educated elite. From the responses to the questionnaire of an ethnological investigation[12] which the Nordic Museum undertook in 1969 on terms of address, it is overwhelmingly clear that for members of social group II and especially III, rank is the all over-ruling factor:

> If a överordnad (superior in rank) says ni or Fru Angquist, then I address him with the title which is owed him. That person will himself have to suggest if there is to be any change.[13]

Next to rank comes age: "Because he was of middle age, and in that case it was not the lady who should suggest." The informant was 20.[14]

More often than not, social group III lacks a rule which involves sex as a variable. In my interviews with 18 low salaried female factory workers all except eight claimed that there was no rule, and those eight said that it was a man's prerogative to initiate du.

The highly formalized ritual of dricka du-skål "drinking a du toast" has now become much simplified although it still can occur. A member of the high nobility writes as follows:

> Now it is much easier to become du. I usually propose it as soon as it is practical. I usually say something like: "Skall vi inte lägga bort titlarna" 'shan't we put titles away', it is much easier so.[15]

The act of becoming on du terms is called lägga bort titlarna ('put the titles away') and so reflects its origin in the higher classes which had titles. There are other linguistic correlates which help define this speech act: stå fadder 'stand godfather' (if such hesitation exists that neither partner can bring themselves to initiate as in the case of a young woman and an old man of high rank, a third party may be brought in to break the ice), du-broder 'du-brother,' etc.

Finally the attitudes of the speakers themselves are clear indications that they perceive different semantics of du. They say so. Typical remarks are "I want to keep du for those I am very close to" versus "It feels like a relief when that happens" (being addressed by du). One feels equal."[16] There are of course exceptions, but in general intimacy du is associated with social group I usage and solidarity du with social group III. In the Nordic Museum investigation, the last question inquires about the informants' attitudes towards the various reforms of address suggested during the last hundred years in Sweden. Of the 26 responses from members of social group I, all with only one exception want to keep ni and/or titles. Of the 55 responses from social group III, all with four exceptions wanted general usage of du to all people. (Of the four exceptions, three are upwardly socially mobile as measured by occupation or children's occupation.) Social group II, on the other

hand, showed no clear trend: of the 50 responses, 29 favored the maintained use of ni while 14 were in favor of a du-reform, i.e. general use of du to everyone. The maintained use of ni of course implies an intimacy semantics for du.

We see then that we have two semantics of du with a tendency to separate along class lines. Intimacy du is always used with FN or KT while solidarity may be expressed in four ways: 1) du + ØN, 2) du + T, 3) du + NN, and 4) du + FN in increasing order of intimacy. The fact that two du exist is not recognized, and there are constant complaints from encounters where the speakers apply different sets of rules with no recognition of the difference. An anecdote will serve to illustrate.

Herr and fru (Mr. and Mrs.) Nilsson, members of social group II with origin in III, are caretakers of a farm, owned by Lennart B., a member of the Stockholm upper class. The men are approximately of the same age, and because of his social rank, Mr. B. initiated the use of du with Mr. Nilsson and the two now freely exchange du and FN. But with Fru Nilsson, Mr. B. was stuck. His rules say that a woman initiates du no matter what, while Mrs. Nilsson has no such rule. Her rule gives rank precedence and if she does have a rule regarding precedence of sex, it will be that the male initiates. Nor does she use ni (see the discussion below) with the result that she addresses Mr. B. as Direktör B. in third person (#4 in the list above), a practice Mr. B. dislikes intensely.

Mrs. B., on the other hand, who knows perfectly well that Mr. and Mrs. Nilsson would prefer to use du with her and that it is up to her to initiate according to everyone's rules, refuses to do so. To her, the semantic of du is strongly one of intimacy, and when pressed by her

social-democratic children for reasons of egalitarianism to become du with the Nilssons, she will say, "But I don't know them that well." Mrs. Nilsson is likely to perceive that distance as one of social class rather than as of personal friendship. And certainly neither of them realizes that they don't share the same set of rules.

One more anecdote to illustrate the two du. At a visit to the Kungliga Biblioteket, Royal Library, to fill out application forms, I was addressed as du by the librarian, a woman older than myself. She knew from the forms my occupation as professor and this did not impress her (professors rank very highly in the social order in Sweden) sufficiently to avoid du + ØN. Her use was clearly that of solidarity du to strangers. In the course of the interview of filling out the cards she discovered my Stockholm identity, as it were; she had known my father and for some years lived in the same apartment house as my family. At this point she changed to ni. (It is considered the height of rudeness to switch back to ni after an initiation ritual to intimacy du.) Du, at this stage, when I had ceased to be an anonymous stranger, would to her imply an intimacy du, and she changed to the mode of address we would mutually employ, had we been introduced in the street.

C. Ni

While the two semantics of du is not recognized at all, the different semantics of ni are described in the literature and accounted for by the historical development of the linguistic form. There is however considerable confusion in the century long public debate in the press over the use of the pronoun, and as late as 1963, Rosengren could write: "The Swedish language still lacks a generally accepted word of address."[17]

The general uncertainty regarding the semantics of ni no doubt has contributed to the recent rapid spread of du.

Ni derives from I which was originally the second person plural form. According to Wellander, during the middle ages titles came into use (influenced by the Byzantine court), "insisted on by those who had a right to them among royalty and nobility, priesthood and the learned."[18] This led to the development of two pronouns of politeness: third person singular han/hon 'he/she' and the plural I. This I developed along three different lines.

1. peasant ni

Among the peasant population, ni (with regional variations of I and ji) became an address of respect reserved for parents, older relatives and worthy elders within the community. It occurred typically with KT and/or FN and was non-reciprocal with the speaker receiving du. This ni took the place of du as evidenced by the gradual replacement of ni by du as the children grew up and reached adult status and also by the fact that ni was occasionally refused with "I'm not so old you'll have to say ni."[19] This ni is today rural and rapidly disappearing. I myself have never heard it, but several of my students said they had called their parents by ni.

2. impolite ni

Given this development, it is unclear and curious how ni came to be received with such very negative connotations that its usage would be conceived as an insult by parts of the population. A multitude of folk sayings arose as a rejoinder to ni: "Do you think I am lousy?" (meaning that with fleas the addressee would have been plural), "Ni the farmer called his mare when he didn't know her name." etc.[20] Wellander and

Ahlgren account for this development by the fact that ni came to be used by the upper classes downward to their inferiors while they expected to be addressed by their titles, and that this non-reciprocity was the cause of the bad reputation of ni.

> When the new time came in (1800's) and the du of the old ståndssamhället 'estate society' by politeness was substituted with the modern ni, the mark of social class was transferred from du to ni which naturally follows with nonreciprocal address forms: he addressed by ni got an inferiority complex visavis the titled person.[21]

By by this argument the earlier non-reciprocal condescending du should have shared the same fate. Ahlgren reasons that a downward ni would be felt more distancing, more haughty, more arrogant than downward du because the inferiors knew that the speaker used ni to strangers and du to friends: "A downward directed form of address also used between friends has larger possibilities to survive than a downward directed form also used between strangers."[22] I am not convinced by this argument but I am at a loss to find a better explanation.

It is however beyond a doubt that ni came to be considered as a rude form of address by parts of the population and in all social classes. For whatever reasons, people who acquiesced at an endless use of titles, which certainly marked the status relationship, balked at ni on the grounds that it marked a superior/inferior status relationship. This considered rudeness of ni is no doubt the major reason for the extreme address avoidance and circumscriptions that one finds in Swedish. From my notes on address to customers in department stores I have:

Skall det betalas kontant	'Shall it be paid in cash'
Vad skall vi ha?	'What shall we have?'
Om damen går...	'If the lady goes...'etc.

with only two occurrences of ni, (during five months' observation) one by a much older woman and the second, interestingly enough, after I had completed my purchase -- no need to be polite any more, I suppose.

By necessity, I visited one of the same department stores on December 27, the first day stores were open after the Crhistmas holidays. The store was crowded, with the majority of customers trying to exchange or return gifts. The clerks gave an impression, say my notes, of kranky sullenness and I heard so many ni's that I lost count. Clearly ni is an integral part of Swedish clerks' linguistic competence but in some situations carefully avoided.

Peculiarly enough, the nominative form is much more avoided than the genitive ers, eders and the oblique er, eder. From my notes on bus drivers, whose general tendency was pronoun avoidance, I have the delightful: "Har damen biljett, gå och sått er bara." 'If the lady has a ticket, just go and sit down' and also "...kan gå och sätta er" '...can go and sit down' which must syntactically have been ni kan gå but the ni was totally inaudible.

Peasant ni is clearly distinguishable from this, by some considered impolite, ni in that the former always co-occurs with KT and/or FN while the latter never does. This ni can occur with no name or with (T)LN although there is considerable evidence from my data that an anonymous use of ni to a stranger in public when dressed in streetclothes (marking, I suppose, the non-personal nature of the relationship) is no longer considered impolite. The police, e.g. freely use ni to strangers, but only to those they take to be members of social group I and II; to members of III and to the young they use solidarity du. However, the lower ranks do not use ni to their own superiors whom they address with TLN in third

person (example #4 in the list above); ni in that situation is considered disrespectful and impolite. There is however no way formally to distinguish between polite and impolite ni; it is simply a matter of attitude transmitted through upbringing.

3. polite ni

The third development of ni took place in the elite where du and ni became patterned after French tu and vous. Ahlgren writes: "Apparently ni during the earlier half of the 1800's has had its strongest support within the aristocracy -- where it was perceived as corresponding to French vous -- and within the peasant class, whereas the growing middle class more often used titles."[23] Certainly, the spokesmen for the ni-reforms (for widespread use of ni) advocated during the 1800 and 1900's were all members of the aristocracy and/or the intelligentsia.

One of the informants to the Nordic Museum survey from social group III writes:

> Already in primary school, our teacher warned us against the use of ni as term of address because it was considered as a cussword. He said that in course language there was an expression "Ni kan kyssa mig där bak." 'Ni can kiss me behind.' For this reason he advised us to use ni only when we spoke to bildat folk 'educated people' so that no misunderstandings would occur.[24]

He had an unusually sensitive teacher. Especially the folkschool teachers show wide variance in their acceptance of ni, and many children were categorically taught never to use ni while others were taught that it was perfectly acceptable (apparently by teachers of strong egalitarian convictions), and according to many informants such teachings remained with them throughout life.

In my earlier paper I pointed out that "the free use of ni might be said to be a hallmark of address behavior between members of social group I, who are not on familiar terms with each other."[25] My later work

has found no evidence which contradicts this observation, and considerable evidence to support it. The statement needs to be modified to "the free use of ni + TLN," since ni + ØN to strangers has become fairly common, especially in the intercourse between the public and the many federal institutions like the post office, transportation, communications, etc.

Because of the widespread institutional du, I have fairly few direct observations of reciprocal ni + TLN but without exception they all involve members of social group I. A typical example is the Nobel Awards banquet where the guests addressed each other by ni + TLN. Some may like my own group have switched to familiarity du after proper toasting ceremonies, but those I know of did not. My own address system underwent a drastic change as a result of my findings, and I virtually never use ni + TLN anymore. At the banquet I promptly initiated du with the professor on my right but the one on my left was much older than I, grey-haired and so distinguished that I hesitated. When I pointed out my dilemma to him, adding teasingly that he could not very well initiate, he delightedly said: "Det är vad du tror" 'That's what you think' and raised his glass in the ritual toast. A younger gentleman across the table then raised his glass and said "May I join you?" The three men then prompted the woman across from me to follow my example and initiate du with them which she did. Clearly the men were more than willing to use du but the women were reluctant to initiate and so in most groups ni and TLN prevailed. But note that the use of ni + TLN and the ritual initiation ceremony for switching to du were partially a function of the occasion. According to both my partners at table, had I met them at the university they would have addressed me as du without further ado. Present at the musical soiree which followed the dinner and mingling with the guests were technicians from radio/TV,

by official order dressed in white tie. In my conversation with them, there was mutual use of solidarity du + ØN. This episode can be taken to illustrate the ruling principle of all encounters in Swedish in normal situations: the speaker attempts to speak in a fashion he believes will please the addressee (not necessarily consciously so). The sequence followed by the dinner guests of 1) introduction of self which consisted of saying one's first and last name aloud followed by a handshake, 2) use of ni + TLN (in order to know which title to use one must either study the place lists carefully before dinner or else find out surreptiously), 3) initiation ceremony, and 4) use of du + FN, I felt would be considered putting on airs by the working class technicians so I omitted all of that sequence and simply used du and no name to them. Certainly I made no such conscious analysis at the time. And certainly one can never be sure that one guesses correctly how the other would like to be addressed; hence all the agony Swedes experience in addressing their fellow man.

On the whole, social group III members avoid the use of ni in speaking to members of group I as they believe it is not polite. Members of group I similarly avoid the use of their customary ni when speaking to those of inferior social status although they are not conscious that they do so. When asked why they don't address the cleaningwoman and the grocer with ni, the typical reply is "Well, they wouldn't like it." Maybe they wouldn't, but the unfortunate result is that the cumbersome address in the third person continues: "Professor Anderson said that Professor Anderson would come as soon as Professor Anderson could," (in speaking to him, "you said that you would come as soon as you could.")[26] The relief that people

find in turning to general du is obvious, and it is only regretted by those from social group I who are in most situations perfectly comfortable with ri. In the Nordic Museum questionnaire, only two members (both ministers of the church) from social group I objected to the use of ni while only two (of 55 responses) from social group III were for ni.

To sum up the discussion of ni, there exist three different ni: 1) the old peasant ni + KT and/or FN, which was recognized by all as a mark of respect, 2) an anonymous ni + ØN to strangers and 3) ni + TLN. Anonymous ni is generally accepted although today it is rapidly being replaced by solidarity du, so rapidly that an individual's usage will vary day from day depending on his mood that day. It is especially this fluctuation between anonymous ni and solidarity du to strangers which leads Swedes to believe that their address system is totally irregular. Ni + TLN is considered, for no identifiable reasons, impolite by many, especially in social groups II and III and its free reciprocal use is typically found only in social group I.

III. CONCLUSION

The Swedish address system is in a stage of rapid change with an increased use of solidarity du + ØN, brought about by the dominant political ideology, and no doubt facilitated by the awkwardness of the previous usage which most Swedes are relieved to escape. Swedes are given to generalizations that 1) today everyone uses du and 2) there are no stateable rules for address usage. Neither proposition is true, and I have attempted in this paper to account for those rules. The major argument has been that an adequate description of the Swedish address system is only possible through the recognition that the social classes have different rules due to different semantics of the pronouns du and ni.

REFERENCES

1. Seymour Lipset quoted in Rolland G. Paulston, Educational Change in Sweden. New York: Teachers College Press, 1968, p. 5.

2. "Sociala strukturen lika efter 60 år," Svenska Dagbladet. (Stockholm), August 14, 1970, p. 1.

3. Tom Soderberg, Två sekler svensk medelklass. Stockholm: Bonniers, 1972.

4. The reported data was highly accurate.

5. C.B. Paulston, "Language Universals and Socio-Cultural Implications in Deviant Usage: Personal Questions in Swedish," Studia Linguistica, 1974. To this list should be added one more form: Vad vill du ha, froken Lundgren. This curious usage of informal du + formal title last name is the mode of addressal between clerks (normally on first name terms) in better shops in the presence of a customer. The existence of this usage is frequently denied by Swedes but it occurs in my data both as self-report and in my own observations.

6. Roger Brown and Albert Gilman, "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity," Style in Language, ed. T.A. Sebeok Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press, 1960, pp. 253-276.

7. Professor Einar Haugen, Harvard University, at the forty-sixth annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, December 28-30, 1971.

8. "Semantics" is the term used by Brown and Gilman to refer to the "covariation between the pronoun used and the objective relationship existing between speaker and addressee," p. 253.

9. Brown and Gilman, 255-257.

10. Only scholars and those involved with the Nobel Fund are invited to the banquet so virtually all guests (except spouses) are academicians.

11. Dispensation rules in Susan Ervin-Tripp's terminology, "The Structure of Communicative Choice," Language Acquisition and Communicative Choice. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1973, p. 307.

12. Nordiska Museet, Etnologiska undersökningen, Frågelista 194, Tilltalsord. Stockholm, 1969.

13. Nordiska Museet, KU2411.

14. Nordiska Museet, KU2854.

15. Nordiska Museet, KU2418. Indeed, the ritual has become much simplified. One of my favorite pieces of self-report data concerns another member

of the nobility who initiated du with my informant while sharing a urinal with him in the men's room.

16. Nordiska Museet, KU2920.

17. Karl Erik Rosengren, "Ni-Reform-Nit," Studie Kamraten, No. 6, 1963, 109.

18. Erik Wellander, "Ni eller du?" Svenska Dagbladet, August 13, 1952, p. 7. See also E. Wellander, Språk och Språkvard. Stockholm, Norstedts, 1964.

19. Perry Ahlgren, "Tilltalsordet Ni:s historia," unpublished Phil. Lic. dissertation, University of Uppsala, 1973, p. 78.

20. Ahlgren, 75, 76.

21. Wellander, 7.

22. Ahlgren, 121.

23. Ahlgren, 135.

24. Nordiska Museet, KU2930.

25. C.B. Paulston, P. 14 in MS.

26. The example is from Wellander, 7.